

Robert Bridenbaugh et al.
Application No.: 09/121,798
Page 2

PATENT

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 14-16 and add new 22 as follows. Please substitute
the following clean version of claims 14-16 and add new claim 22.

14. (Amended) The method of claim 22, wherein steps (a), (b), (c),
and (d) are carried out simultaneously.

15. (Amended) The method of claim 22, wherein steps (a), (b), (c), (d)
and (e) are carried out simultaneously.

16. (Amended) The method of claim 22, wherein steps (a), (b), (c), (d)
(e) and (f) are carried out simultaneously.

22. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein the steps are performed in a
continuous process on a single large volume sample.

REMARKS

Status

Claims 1-22 are pending and under consideration in this application, no
claims being deleted claim 22 being added and claims 14-16 being amended herein.
Support for new claim 22 may be found in the specification at least on page 8, line 28 -
page 9, line 9 and page 23, lines 16-18. Claims 14-16 are amended to change
dependency from claim 1 to new claim 22. No new matter is added by these
amendments.

In the Final Office Action mailed January 3, 2002 claims 14-16 were
rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Claims 1-21
were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over EP 517,515 A2
("Ogawa") in view of US 6,197,553 B1 ("Lee"), US 5,837,529 ("Wan") and Song *et al.*,
J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans., 91:3389-3398 (1995) ("Song"). Claims 18-21 were
rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting on the
grounds that are unpatentable over claims 1-62 of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,148. Applicants